AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 5. This sheet, which includes only Fig. 5, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 5. In Fig. 5, element number 513, and its associated lead line, is added to conform to the application language at page 23, line 2.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS

Introduction

The Office action dated August 10, 2005, and the references cited therein have been carefully considered. In response, the applicant offers the following remarks.

Office Action Objection

Claim 9 was objected to because it was not clear to what "BDI" referred. In response, claim 9 is currently amended to remove the reference to "BDI".

Office Action Rejections

Claims 1-12 are pending and were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chase, et al., U.S. Patent Number 5,944,780 ("Chase") in view of Dujari, et al., U.S. Patent 6,119,153 ("Dujari").

Summary of the Prior Art

Chase discloses a method of data caching on a computer network which maintains a central cache directory at a network server to improve the perceived data retrieval speed of the network. Each time a user station caches a data object received from a remote network, it informs the central cache directory. When a station seeks an object from the remote network, the local network server first checks the central directory cache to see if the request can be satisfied at one of the local stations. Only if the request cannot be satisfied at one of the local stations is the requested object retrieved from the remote network.

Dujari discloses a system which increases perceived Internet browser performance by using low or high-bandwidth data sources such as a CD-ROM and/or a hard drive directory as a local, installable cache of Internet content.

Arguments for patentability under § 103(a)

The issue of patentability raised by the Office action and which the applicant must overcome is whether the applicant's invention is non-obvious. The applicant submits that claims 1-12 meet the requirements of patentability set out by 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and are therefore allowable.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, and hence to find claims 1-12 unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), three basic criteria must be met. First, there

must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. MPEP at § 2142 (emphasis added).

Here, the present application's structure is for a purpose, and has properties, that are not obtainable from the cited prior art structures. First, the "directory cache" structure is not obtainable from nor does it have a similar purpose to the cited Chase device. Regarding independent claims 1 and 7, the Office action states that Chase discloses "...the client computer hosting an application... and a directory cache ...." To support this statement, the Office action cites Chase's "local cache" illustrated by figure 1, element 20. Chase further explains that the "local cache" is a storage device for quick access to data retrieved by the client machine from a remote server (col. 5, lines 47-61). However, the present application's "directory cache" is merely a record of data locations on remote servers (page 2, lines 14-22). Even though the present application's directory cache resides on each local machine in the same way as Chase's local cache, the Chase structure does not exist to record data locations, but rather as a repository for the data itself. (Col. 5, lines 47-61 and Col. 6, lines 14-20)

Furthermore, the Office action states that Chase teaches inspecting the directory cache to determine whether a valid enumeration of the contents of the target directory is cached in the directory cache. Chase does not teach or suggest this limitation. The valid enumeration described in the present application refers to the accuracy of the directory cache's file listing located on each client machine (page 13, lines 17-22). Chase, however, describes checking client requests against a central cache directory to determine whether or not the data actually exists in any local cache. As cited by the Office action, col. 4, lines 3-11, col. 5, lines 60-61, col. 6, lines 61-62, and col. 7 lines 3-6 respectively state:

> In order to implement a system according to the invention, a central cache directory would have to be maintained on the local network, either at the network's gateway to the remote network, or, preferably, in a separate directory server. Each remote network request would be checked against the central cache directory to determine whether or not any local cache contains the requested data. If so, the request would be routed to the

> local station that has cached the data; otherwise, the
> request would be sent to the remote network....
>
> ...remote network 14, the client software <u>first looks to
> cache 20 of that station 12 to see if the data are already
> in cache</u> 20....
>
> ...(after other startup processes). At test 32, <u>it is
> determined whether or not there are any data in cache</u>
> 20. If so, then at...
>
> ...Next, at step 35, when a request is received, the
> process proceeds to test 36 to <u>determine whether or not
> the request can be satisfied by the local cache 20. If so,
> the cached data object is returned</u> to the client software
> for display at step 37....

As described in the last three Chase citations listed above, the cache structures refer to local data caches bearing no cognizable relation to the present application's directory cache. Taken together, the four citations teach a central cache directory against which requests for data are checked to see whether the request may be fulfilled by a local data cache, or a remote request to another server. Conversely, claims 1 and 7 of the present application describe checking the cache directory against the target directory to ensure that the cache directory is an accurate listing of the data contained in the target directory ("...inspecting the directory cache to determine whether a valid enumeration of the contents of the target directory is cached in the directory cache..." claim 1, page 25, lines 9-10, and "...inspecting the directory cache to determine whether a valid entry for the target file is contained in the enumeration of the contents of the target directory..." claim 7, page 27, lines 12-13). Using a directory cache to validate requests for data, as in Chase, is an entirely different limitation than the present application's determining the cache's accuracy as a representation of the target directory.

Because Chase does not teach or suggest the claim 1 and 7 limitations cited by the Office action, its combination with Dujari to reject a portion of those same claims must fail. Furthermore, Dujari itself does not contain all limitations of either claim 1 or 7. Therefore, independent claims 1 and 7, and all remaining claims depending thereon, meet the requirements of patentability set out by 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and are in condition to be allowed.

Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, the applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and passage to issuance of this application. The applicant invites the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorney with any questions regarding this response or the application as a whole. If there are any additional fees or refunds required, the Commissioner is directed to charge or debit Deposit Account No. 13-2855.

Respectfully submitted for,

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP

October 20, 2005

By:_____

William J. Kramer
Reg. No. 46,229
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP
233 South Wacker Drive
6300 Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357
(312) 474-6300